

PCT

(PCT Rule 66)

Date of Mailing (day/month/year) 22 JAN 2004

REPLY DUE

within 1 months/days from
the above date of mailing

Priority date (day/month/year)

08 January 2002 (08.01.2002)

IPC(7): C12Q 1/68; A01N 43/04; C07H 21/04; A61K 31/07 and US Cl.: 435/325, 375, 5, 6; 536/24.5; 514/44, 2; 424/130.1

CHIRON CORPORATION

1. This written opinion is the first (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.
2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:
- I ☒ Basis of the opinion
 - II ☐ Priority
 - III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
 - IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
 - V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2 (a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
 - VI ☐ Certain documents cited
 - VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
 - VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application

3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension. See rule 66.2(d).

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 *bis*.
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.

4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 08 May 2004 (08.05.2004)

Telephone No. (703) 308-0196

DOCKETED on/by

Atty. CAh PA

File # RP17767.003

Due Date 8-15-00 Ext 121-1750

Final Date

Ext.
2104-2502
to 1st visit
Dinner

I. Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the elements of the international application:*

- ☒ the international application as originally filed
- ☒ the description:
 pages 1-120, as originally filed
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____
- ☒ the claims:
 pages 121-123, as originally filed
 pages NONE, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____
- ☐ the drawings:
 pages NONE, as originally filed
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____
- ☒ the sequence listing part of the description:
 pages 1-126, as originally filed
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☒ contained in the international application in printed form.
- ☒ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages NONE
- ☐ the claims, Nos. NONE
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/fig NONE

5. ☐ This opinion has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed."

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/CN/00/00657

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. STATEMENT

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>NONE</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-30</u>	NO
Inventive Step (IS)	Claims <u>NONE</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-30</u>	NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-30</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Claims 1-30 meet industrial applicability as defined by PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.

Claims 1-30 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2)-(3) as being anticipated by Hillman et al. Hillman et al. disclose compositions comprising vesicle membrane protein-like proteins (VMP). The vesicle membrane protein-like proteins disclosed by Hillman et al. are also known as DKFZ. Hillman et al. also disclose methods for treating and preventing disorders associated with the expression of VMP.

Claims 1-30 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Vaccaro et al. and Dusetti et al. Vaccaro et al. teach further studies leading to a better understanding of the function of VMP expression are needed. Dusetti et al. teach further studies leading to a better understanding of the function of VMP expression is warranted. The teachings of Vaccaro et al. and Dusetti et al. provide clear motivation for one skilled in the art to inhibit the expression of VMP to understand its function in vivo.

----- NEW CITATIONS -----

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PC 03/00657

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

TIME LIMIT:

The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended. 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Examination Report.